



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,935	02/25/2004	Paul Tzeng	3313-1119P	9554
2292 7590 10/01/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER LE, THI Q	
			ART UNIT 2613	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,935

Applicant(s)

TZENG ET AL.

Examiner

Thi Q. Le

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 3/27/2007. **Claims 1, 3-8** are still pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL**

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 10/11/2006, 12/13/2006 was considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 2613

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
6. **Claims 1-4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Britz (US PGPub 200402022474)** in view of **Agurok et al. (US Patent # 6,369,925)** and further in view of **Ruziak (US Patent # 6,907,013)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Britz discloses a wireless signal transmission and receiving system applied for a display device for receiving wireless signals omni directionally, comprising:

a plurality of transmitting units from multiple sources for sending optical signals via optical beams (figures 2 shows the process of electrically combining multiplex independent data signals through the use of an Electrical multiplexer 81, paragraph 0023; figure 3 shows the process of creating redundant optical signals, paragraph 0026); and

a plurality of receiving units for collecting redundant optical signals (figure 3 shows, there are a plurality of receiving units, one for each wavelength. For example optical/electrical converter 66 and 68, for receiving the two redundant wavelengths shown; paragraph 0027),

wherein each of the receiving units further comprises a photodiode for converting the single optical signal into the electrical signal (Britz discloses, the optical/electrical converter 66 and 68 are photodiodes; figure 3, paragraph 0027).

Britz discloses first converting the redundant optical signals into electrical signal then combining the electrical signals, but fails disclose combining the redundant optical signals to a single optical signal; and fails to disclose, inputting the electrical signal into a display device.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teaching of Britz from first converting optical signals into electrical signals then combining the electrical signals, to first combine the optical signals then convert the optical signal into an electrical signal, since the applicant has not disclosed that the process of firstly combining the optical signals then converting the optical signal into electrical signal is critical versus the process of first converting the optical signals into electrical signals then combining the electrical signals. Further, Agurok discloses, the process of first combining the optical signals then converting the optical signal into electrical signal, shown on figure 3, column 6 lines 20-31. Thus, it would have been obvious that the modification to the teaching of Britz, would have achieved the same result.

In related art, Ruziak discloses a wireless communication system for multi media devices. The system includes a remote unit 24 that is connected to the television set 28, wherein the remote unit 24 is configured to receive cable television signal from base unit 22 and converting the signal for displaying on the television set 29; figure 1 column 7 lines 1-10.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Ruziak with Agurok et al. Since Ruziak provides a high-speed communication link capable of supporting interactive multimedia transmission.

Art Unit: 2613

Consider **claim 3, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose, wherein the transmitting units further comprises beam forming optics (Britz discloses, the transmitting side includes optical telescope 58; figure 3, paragraph 0026).

Consider **claim 4, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose, wherein the receiving units further comprises beam collecting optics (Britz discloses, the receiving side includes optical telescope 62, figure 3, paragraph 0027).

Consider **claim 5, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Britz as modified by Agurok further disclose, except for, wherein the optical signals are converted from audio and video source devices.

In related art, Ruziak disclose, a wireless communication system, wherein the optical signals are converted from audio and video source devices (read as, optical communication signals from the television 28 and baser unit 22; figures 1a-c) (figures 1a-c; column 6 lines 43-54).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Ruziak with Agurok et al. Since Ruziak provides a high-speed communication link capable of supporting interactive multimedia transmission.

Consider **claim 6, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose,, wherein the optical signals are converted from computers (read as, optical communication signals from the personal data assistant 29 and baser unit 22; Ruziak, figures 1a-c) (Ruziak, figures 1a-c; column 6 lines 50-55).

Consider **claims 7 and 8, and as applied to claim 1 above**, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose, wherein the optical signals are analog or digital in nature (read as,

Art Unit: 2613

IR communication links may carry either digital or analog data; Ruziak) (Ruziak, column 3 lines 34-36).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Thi Le whose telephone number is (571) 270-1104. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Application/Control Number: 10/784,935

Page 8

Art Unit: 2613

Thi Le



KENNETH VANDERPUYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER